2

1

3

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

for example, where it is necessary for the jury to have a view of the property. That is a whole class of cases which has never been subject to removal and it never has been.

I don't think the adoption of that amendment would change that rule or law. I take it that the rules could include conditions. It might say that it required good cause shown or the possibility of prejudice before it might allow removal. All such things as that.

It was my intention in voting for this, my thought, that the General Assembly or the Court of Appeals would have full power to make classifications and while the right was mandated, it was not any particular right, but a right subject to such condition as to time or otherwise that might be imposed by rule.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair concurs, Delegate Henderson, that the interpretation you suggest is positive. My concern is that it is not as clear as it might be. I think it might be worthwhile to take the recess to see if the language can be clarified.

For what purpose does Delegate Moser rise?